

weren't run very well. Which was often true. So let's knock them all down and too bad for the people who used to live there, even though most of those people worked. I am going to remind my colleague and others, they don't live there for free. Under the law, they pay 30 percent of their income to live in that housing. He wanted to knock them all down.

Some of us fought back and said: OK, we want to reform them. We want to build better communities. We will work with you here. So because I stepped in and a bunch of others stepped in, Catholic Charities and many activists from all walks of life, including the business community, we said: We are going to rebuild these communities. Well here is the most amazing thing about it: it is working. Shawn Donovan, our Housing Secretary, was just there. We had standing room only, with people from every different race and walk of life. We are patting ourselves on the back saying: It was bad 10 years ago. It was bad 5 years ago. But now we are all working together in the spirit of unity in a city that has been absolutely brought to its knees by flooding and by political bickering and bomb throwing. And we made things better. Then this amendment has to hit the floor. It is a disgrace. I urge my colleagues to vote no on amendment 2359.

While I am here, I will say a word about another amendment that has been agreed to this afternoon by 73 votes, unfortunately. It was another Vitter amendment. It was amendment No. 2376. I voted no. There were 26 of us who voted no, but 73 Senators voted yes. I know I am in the minority, but that is what the Senate is about, giving the minority a voice. I wish to say something about this. This amendment reinstated a law that says that if you live in public housing, you have to do 8 hours of community service. That sounds pretty good. People think, we are providing housing for people. They should be grateful. The least they can do is community service.

I am a big supporter of community service. I try to do it when I can. I support community service and I support calling all of our citizens to community service. What I don't support is making poor people and mostly minorities do community service, while other people sit on the sideline and never are required to do it, even though the largesse they receive from our government is much greater than a resident of public housing could ever hope to get even if they lived there for 50 years.

If you lived in public housing for 50 years, you could not possibly benefit as much from the General Treasury as if you would if you were the executive of AIG to whom we gave a gazillion dollars. Did we ask them to do 8 hours of community service? We didn't even ask him to pay the money back. Somebody has to wake up in this Chamber.

I am not fussing at my colleagues because I know people have a different

view about this. But if we want to require law students to do 8 hours of community service for the loans they get, fine. But don't just pick on the poor because they can't fight back, and they don't have any lobbyists up here for them.

Those are the two amendments my colleague could come up with today. I can't wait to see what he comes up with tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

#### AFGHANISTAN AND THE NATO ALLIANCE

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, Senators LIEBERMAN, MCCAIN, and GRAHAM took the floor a few minutes ago. I have some concerns about the direction we are heading in Afghanistan as well.

Yesterday the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ADM Mike Mullen, came before the Senate Armed Services Committee and said that success in Afghanistan would probably require more forces and certainly more time. I think all of us who are aware of what is going on there—and certainly I was there last year myself; many of us have gone over there to see for ourselves what the conditions are—and I think clearly we can all agree we are going to have more time in Afghanistan.

While the Chairman did not specifically ask for more troops, and had not had a request from GEN Stanley McChrystal, who is the senior American officer and NATO commander in Afghanistan, he did, however, indicate he “believed—having heard General McChrystal’s views—and having great confidence in his leadership,” as we all do—“a properly resourced counterinsurgency probably means more forces, and, without question, more time and more commitment to the protection of the Afghan people and to the development of good governance.”

There are currently approximately 64,000 American troops in Afghanistan. But it is becoming increasingly clear that we cannot achieve our goals in Afghanistan unless we add additional troops and anticipate a protracted effort.

To his credit, President Obama laid out a new strategy in March. It properly put primary emphasis on building the governance capacity of Afghanistan and building up Afghan security forces. He also said he would send—and has—21,000 additional U.S. troops. We know now that was probably not enough and more troops will be needed.

Just this week, the President said we should “not expect a sudden announcement of some huge change in strategy,” and he further pledged that the issue was “going to be amply debated, not just in Congress, but across the country.”

I welcome that debate. We need to agree as a nation on a strategy for victory, on the resources necessary to

complete the mission. We need to block attempts by the cut-and-run crowd to limit the deployments and operations of U.S. troops or to tie their hands as to what they can do while they are there. We do need more Afghan forces. It should also be abundantly clear that if our strategy is going to work, we must have another resource.

I want to call attention to the role of NATO. With the Taliban resurgent and casualties rising to levels never seen before in Afghanistan, we must have more security forces in Afghanistan, and it is well past time for our NATO allies to step up and do their part.

The security of the free world is at stake in Afghanistan. Sometimes there has been legitimate argument about whether there is a legitimate American interest in some of the places we have gone. It cannot be questioned that in Afghanistan our security interests are at stake. In fact, the credibility of the NATO alliance is at stake, and I think whether the NATO alliance proves it can be successful and relevant in today's world is at stake in Afghanistan.

NATO countries need to realize how much it is in all of our interests to defeat the Taliban resurgence and prevent a new al-Qaida safe haven from developing there. We need to prevent ungoverned territory in Afghanistan from being used by terrorists with global reach, and the only way to ensure this is through a strong and stable Afghan Government. But they are not going to get there without the help of the NATO alliance. The horrors of September 11 were only a taste of what the terrorists, with global reach, might accomplish if they have uncontested territory from which to operate.

Our NATO partners need to realize that the credibility and relevance of the alliance itself is now being tested in Afghanistan. NATO no longer faces a threat on the continent of Europe or even on the periphery of Europe. For NATO to be relevant, it must have a global expeditionary role in the defense of our common interests, particularly against the threat of global terrorism. If NATO cannot succeed in Afghanistan, where we all agree NATO must succeed, the alliance will be weakened to the point that will call into question: Will it succeed anywhere?

Many NATO countries are present in Afghanistan, but among them only a few are bearing the brunt of combat operations: Great Britain, Canada, the Netherlands, Denmark, and, of course, the United States. But just this week, Canada announced its intention to pull out all forces by 2011. Other NATO allies have limited operations of their troops through restrictions on their missions—restrictions that I think are a little embarrassing, frankly.

For example, some nations that have signed up—part of NATO, willing to do their part in Afghanistan—refuse to conduct any operations at night. Others refuse to carry Afghan soldiers on their helicopters. Others are prohibited from participating in combat unless

they are fired on and protecting their own base. In other words, they are prohibited from coming to the aid of an ally under attack.

Let's be frank. If a NATO member cannot handle the responsibilities of alliance membership, they should not enjoy the privileges and prestige of membership. Our NATO allies need to remember what was agreed to in Bonn in December of 2001. The alliance gave their solemn word to help Afghanistan overcome the ravages of terrorism and civil war. The credibility of our allies is at stake.

The NATO alliance has a very simple mission. It is: If one is attacked, we are all attacked. America has come to the aid of European nations well into the last century—throughout the last century. America was attacked on 9/11, 2001, and we have not seen the response that would meet the test of the mission of NATO. We have not seen our allies on the field in Iraq, with notable exceptions. Great Britain has always been there. Others have been there part time. But America has carried the lion's share. They are carrying, by far, the lion's share in Iraq today.

Afghanistan is the hotbed in that area, between Afghanistan and Pakistan, of al-Qaida, which was the attacker of our country on 9/11. NATO agreed in December of 2001 that they would be engaged in Afghanistan, and yet NATO has not fulfilled its responsibility, even though the lion's share of our troops—our troops who have done an outstanding job, our troops who are fatigued from overdeployment have done their jobs—have not had the help of NATO.

NATO is supported by the taxpayers of America because we thought it would be an alliance that would come to our aid, as we have come to the aid of every member of NATO. The United States pays 24 percent of the operating costs of NATO.

I am the ranking member of the Military Construction Subcommittee of Appropriations, and I can tell you that the military enhancements and military construction for NATO are in the range of \$230 million in this year's bill. It is usually in that range—sometimes a little more, sometimes a little less. But basically America is paying a quarter of a billion dollars every year for military construction and enhancements for NATO.

There are not NATO bases in America. They are in other places. Yet we are having to now put more troops on the line because our NATO allies have restrictions, except for the ones I have named that are in full combat and full partners and doing their jobs, and we appreciate that so much.

But I think the NATO alliance must step up to the plate. As we are debating more troops, I know we will do what is necessary because America always does what is necessary, and I think our NATO allies know that, but sometimes they just sit back and let us do it. They let our taxpayers pay the tab. They let

our troops be the ones who lead in the field.

We went to Bosnia. Bosnia was in their backyard, but they needed us to step in; also in Kosovo. We have been there for them to step in because when it is necessary America is there. But when we are debating the increase in troop strength in Afghanistan—which everyone who has been there knows we are going to need—let's not forget to bring in another source that would help America in this time of need, while we are continuing to keep our commitments in Iraq with very little help from the outside, while we still have troops in Bosnia, and while we have 64,000 troops, the lion's share, in Afghanistan.

Now we are looking at sending more, and I think now is the time for us to put it on the table for our NATO allies, that they have a commitment, if the NATO alliance is relevant. "If one is attacked, we are all attacked" is a great, simple, clear mission. But it is not simply successful because we have the right mission. It takes every member doing its fair share. And, most certainly, at a time when America is doing so much more, this is the time for our allies to take the shackles off, to engage, to be in combat, to put our treasure on the line with their treasure and not just our treasure alone.

I think it is time for us—and I call on the President—and fulfill the mission. Terrorism is the enemy of every NATO country. This is not an American fight. It is a global fight for freedom. If we lose in Afghanistan and give unfettered territory for operations of al-Qaida, every NATO country will be attacked. Don't they see it? Don't they have the commitment and the courage to stand up? Just because it is in another country and seems far away, can they be so naive?

When we talk about more American troops, as the President has said we will, I ask the President to look for more troops from other sources as well and to ask our allies to step to the plate and be our partners as NATO envisioned.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). The Senator from Maryland.

(The remarks of Mr. CARDIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1678 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CARDIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### IN PRAISE OF ORLANDO FIGUEROA

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. President, I rise once again to recognize the service of

one of America's great Federal employees.

Last week I spoke about an outstanding public servant who refused to give up when she was faced with life-changing trauma. My friend Vice President BIDEN says America's greatest attribute is that when it gets knocked down, it gets right back up.

Perseverance is one of our national strengths. It has seen us through the lean years and the times of war. It has also seen us through the setbacks of our march of science and discovery. In one such setback a few years ago, NASA experienced a string of failures to land an exploratory probe on Mars. After the inspirational voyages of Viking 1 and 2, which landed on the red planet of the 1970s, NASA did not send spacecraft to the surface of Mars for 20 years. After a brief but successful return in 1997 by the Mars Pathfinder, NASA prepared a series of missions aimed at exploring the Martian surface and laying the groundwork for a future astronaut mission.

The enthusiasm at NASA and in our Nation's scientific community quickly turned to disappointment as two consecutive missions failed to reach their destination. Some of my colleagues may remember how frustrating it was to learn that one craft burned up in Mars' atmosphere because a contractor measured in English units instead of the metric system used by NASA.

When Orlando Figueroa took charge of NASA's Mars Exploration Rover project in 2001, he set out to change the mood. Optimism and excitement had long been the driving force behind NASA's successes, and Orlando knew that despite recent setbacks, NASA could once again achieve and inspire.

Less than 3 years later, under Orlando's leadership, NASA's Mars Exploration Rover project successfully landed some of the most advanced technology ever created onto the Martian surface.

He pushed his team to look forward, not backward, and Orlando's leadership was critical as the team faced challenges in advance of a rapidly approaching launch date.

The Mars Exploration Rovers—called Spirit and Opportunity—successfully landed on opposite ends of Mars in January 2004 after a 6-month journey.

Together, they traversed several miles of the planet's surface and captured over 100,000 high resolution photographs for use by scientists studying the Martian climate and soil.

The tests conducted by Spirit and Opportunity have brought our researchers closer to finding evidence of water and possibly past life on our neighboring planet.

The Mars Exploration Rover project also reignited the imaginations of countless students.

I have spoken a number of times already about the importance of supporting education in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics or "STEM." The success